

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated July 16, 2007. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 13-14 and 17-18 have been amended, claims 1, 4, 11-12 and 15-16 have been cancelled and new claims 19-20 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments or new claims, support for which may be found, by way of example only, in specification pages 19-25 and FIGS. 13-19. Claims 7-10 were previously cancelled. Thus, claims 2-3, 5-6, 13-14 and 17-20 are presented for consideration in view of the following remarks. A petition for a two (2) month extension of time is submitted herewith.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,635,978 ("*Alten*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,778 ("*Yamamoto*"). And claims 2, 5 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Alten* and *Yamamoto* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,124 ("*Eick*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Independent claims 1, 4, 11 and 12 have been cancelled. New independent claims 19 and 20 have been added. Neither *Alten*, *Yamamoto* nor *Eick* teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, each and every element of independent claims 19 and 20.

By way of example only, the new independent claims require that second program guide information include "the broadcasting time information of the program for every time slot spanned by the program, the time slots being in lengths of an hour, 30 minutes or 15 minutes." These claims also require the use of clone EPG objects in a retrieval table, wherein each of the clone EPG objects is "allocated to a single one of the time slots spanned by the program." Use of the clone EPG object in this manner is important, as it enables retrieval of "a

respective one of the clone EPG objects for the second program guide information from the retrieval table using the given time slot as the search condition." Thus, a program table can be generated "based on the respective clone EPG object."

The Office Action asserts that *Alten* discloses allocating clone program guide objects, referring to column 14, lines 5-15 and to figures 7a-c and 11a-b. According to the Office Action, "program listings are retrieved from the listings database, (as objects) and placed into the appropriate time slots on the EPG display." (Office Action, p.5.) What the cited portion of column 14 actually states is:

FIG. 12 shows an interactive cable converter box 200 including memory 210. Program schedule information could then be downloaded and stored in the converter box memory 210 and displayed on the television receiver in overlaying relationship with the electronic program guide channel display being broadcast on a dedicated cable channel. Thus, the display environment of the disclosed guide channel can be retained, but the listings portion of the guide controlled locally by the subscriber's converter box. In this manner, the video-dominant features of the guide channel are retained, such as the promotional video clips.

(*Alten*, col.14, 11.5-15.)

The Office Action also refers to *Alten's* FIG. 12 and column 14, line 17 through column 15, line 12 as well as FIG. 1 of *Yamamoto* to support its position regarding clone program guide objects. However, applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose clone EPGs and the use of such clone EPGs as indicated above. Thus, for at least these reasons, applicant submits that independent claims 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, claims 2-3, 5-6, 13-14 and 17-18 depend from independent claims 19 and 20, respectively, and contain all

the limitations thereof. Therefore, applicant submits that the subject dependent claims are likewise patentable.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have. If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew T. Zidel  
Registration No.: 45,256  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant